

Appl. No. 10/772,483
Amdt. dated March 10, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 6, 2007

Remarks

The present amendment responds to the final Official Action dated December 10, 2007.

The Official Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Claims 1-9 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Cohen U.S. Patent No. 6,560,576 (Cohen) in view of Ehlen U.S. Publication No. 2004/0006480 (Ehlen). The Official Action maintained the previous rejection of claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Cohen. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to be more clear and distinct. Claims 1-16 are presently pending.

The Section 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

The language objected to as ambiguous has been eliminated by the present amendment. Please call the undersigned if any further indefiniteness issues remain after this amendment.

The Art Rejections

All of the claims were rejected based on Cohen, alone or in combination with Ehlen. As addressed in greater detail below, Cohen and Ehlen do not support the Official Action's reading of them and the rejections based thereupon should be reconsidered and withdrawn. Further, the Applicants do not acquiesce in the analysis of Cohen and Ehlen made by the Official Action and respectfully traverse the Official Action's analysis underlying its rejections.

The Official Action rejected claims 1-9 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Cohen in view of Ehlen. Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Cohen. In light of the present amendment to claims 1 and 10, these grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

Appl. No. 10/772,483
Amdt. dated March 10, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 6, 2007

The limitations of claim 1 in the claimed combination are not taught and are not made obvious by Cohen. Cohen teaches the selection of introductory help prompts as a user is learning to use a system, with help prompts being selected to present information about different features of the system as the user gains experience. Cohen does not address help prompts as a response to unrecognized inputs. Cohen selects new and helpful features to describe to a user as a user gains experience, rather than "selecting the help prompt based upon the user's proficiency and the information identifying the module and the function" at the time the unrecognized input was detected as in claim 1. Ehlen addresses "multi-modal systems" providing "context-sensitive help to a user", and does not cure Cohen's deficiencies as a reference with respect to claim 1.

Claim 10, as amended, addresses "resetting a consecutive error counter" and "selecting a help prompt based on the user's experience level with successfully utilizing the function." These features are not taught and are not made obvious by Cohen or by Cohen and Ehlen. Claim 10, as amended, therefore defines over the relied upon art and should be allowed.

Appl. No. 10/772,483
Amdt. dated March 10, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 6, 2007

Conclusion

All of the presently pending claims, as amended, appearing to define over the applied references, withdrawal of the present rejection and prompt allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter H. Priest
Reg. No. 30,210
Priest & Goldstein, PLLC
5015 Southpark Drive, Suite 230
Durham, NC 27713-7736
(919) 806-1600